

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 6/29/06, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1-10 and 29-35 are still pending.

In the Office Action mailed 6/29/06, the Examiner has required a new oath or declaration. Applicant is submitting a new declaration, which is dated 10/27/2006. Applicant requests the Examiner to accept this new declaration.

In reference to the claim objection of claim 7, Applicant has amended claim 7 to correct the language. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim objection.

In reference to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-10 and 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has amended the claims to ensure proper antecedent bases for the noted citations by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 29, 31, 33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nagami et al. (U.S. Patent 5,835,710; "Nagami") and rejected claims 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 30, 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the same Nagami reference. Applicant submits that Nagami fails to disclose the elements of the independent claims, as amended, for the following reasons.

Nagami discloses a network interconnection apparatus connecting one logical network and another logical network, when a new node is activated beyond the network interconnection. Although routing tables are shown in Nagami (e.g., Figure 7 and 8 of Nagami), such tables are for determining a next HOP address. The amended independent claims 1 and 29 recite a node ID register which is programmable to have primary routing based upon a destination address and a particular type of transaction being transacted. Primary routing is used for particular type of transaction, while alternate override routing is used for other type(s) of transaction(s). The path taken through the plurality of peripheral bus interfaces that are present depends upon the routing selected, based on the

transaction. Applicant submits that these aspects of the embodiments of the invention, as now recited in the amended claims, are not disclosed in Nagami.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and allow pending claims 1-10 and 29-35, as amended.

Furthermore, in order to respond to the outstanding office action, Applicant is submitting a petition for one-month extension of time under a separate cover.

Fees for the extension and surcharge for the declaration are also included with these submissions. However, if there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON, LLP
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 10-30-2006

By: William W. Kidd

William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email:wkidd@texaspatents.com